DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 537 HE 010 764

AUTHOR Beausang, Kenneth R.
TITLE A Comparative Analysis of the Lecture-Discussion Method of Instruction and a Quasi-Individualized Mastery Approach in Introductory Sociology.
PUB DATE 14 Jun 76
NOTE 39p.; A practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Instruction; Comparative Analysis; *Discussion (Teaching Technique); Higher Education; Independent Study; *Individualized Instruction; *Lecture; *Mastery Learning; Pacing; *Sociology; Student Attitudes; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Black Hawk College IL

ABSTRACT

The possible difference in the performance on a mid-term and final exam between students taking a quasi-individualized mastery method of instruction and students having traditional lecture-discussion instruction was studied. A second issue examined was the difference between the proportion of students expressing a preference for one method of instruction over the other. The sample population involved two intact introductory sociology classes at Black Hawk College. Results demonstrated that there was not significant difference between either set of mean scores, nor was there any significant difference between the proportions of students expressing a preference for one method over the other. Self-pacing and class interaction were the main reasons for selecting the individualized method and lecture-discussion method, respectively. It is recommended that: the sociology department should offer both delivery systems within the department; the quasi-individualized mastery method should be studied again with instructors present during testing sessions; and an additional study should compare the lecture-discussion methods with a completely individualized delivery system (Author/LBH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED165537

HE

# A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LECTURE-DISCUSSION METHOD OF INSTRUCTION AND A QUASI-INDIVIDUALIZED MASTERY APPROACH IN INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY

APPLIED EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth Beausang

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

by

Kenneth R. Beausang, M. A.

Black Hawk College

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CLUSTER COORDINATOR

Dr. Robert K. White

QUAD-CITIES CLUSTER

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

June 14, 1976

HE 010 164

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine if there was a significant difference in the performance on a mid-term and final exam between students taking a quasi-individualized mastery method of instruction and students taking a traditional lecture-discussion method of instruction in introductory sociology. A second issue was to determine if there was a difference between the proportion of students expressing a preference for one method of instruction over the other.

The sample population involved two intact introductory sociology classes at Black Hawk College. A cross-over design was used. This design generated two sets of mean scores--the mean scores achieved on a mid-term and final exam by the first and second experimental and control groups respectively. The null hypothesis was tested with a t-test at the .05 level, and the two-tailed critical value of t was utilized.

At the close of the experiment, students were asked to express their preference for one method of instruction over the other, and to give the reasons for their choice. The null hypothesis was tested with a z-test at the .05 level, and the two-tailed critical value of z was utilized.

Results demonstrated that there was no significant difference between either set of mean scores, nor was there any significant difference between the proportions of students expressing a preference for one method of instruction over the other. Self-pacing and class interaction were the main reasons for selecting the individualized method and lecture-discussion method respectively.

Recommendations included: (1) the sociology department should offer both delivery systems within the department; (2) the quasi-individualized mastery method should be studied again with instructors

present during testing sessions; (3) an additional study should compare the lecture-discussion method with a completely individualized delivery system.

Writer's Name Kenneth R. Beausang

Cluster Quad Cities

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

June 10, 1976 (date) Harry DeBauer (signature of peer reader)

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

June 11, 1976 (date) Dennis L. Chesbro (signature of peer reader)

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

June 14, 1976 (date) Thomas D. Quayle (signature of peer reader)

.....

I certify that I have read this practicum report and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards for practicums in the Doctor of Education Program.

(date) (signature of Practicum Director)

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| PEER SIGNATURES | ii |
| LIST OF TABLES | iv |
| THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| THE HYPOTHESES | 1 |
| BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE | 1 |
| DEFINITION OF TERMS | 5 |
| LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY | 6 |
| BASIC ASSUMPTIONS | 7 |
| PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA | 8 |
| PROCEDURES FOR TREATING DATA | 10 |
| RESULTS | 12 |
| DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 15 |
| Residual Finding | 16 |
| Further Studies | 16 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 18 |
| APPENDIX | 19 |
| Document I | 19 |
| Document II | 22 |
| Document III | 23 |
| Document IV | 24 |

LIST OF TABLES


Page

1. A Comparion of Scores Achieved on the Mid-term Exam by Students in the First Experimental Group and First Control Group..... 12

2. A Comparison of Scores Achieved on the Final Exam by Students in the Second Experimental Group and Second Control Group..... 13

3. A Comparison of the Percentage of Students Expressing a Preference for One Method of Instruction Over the Other..... 13

4. Simple Frequency Distribution of Scores Achieved on the Mid-term Exam by Students in the First Experimental Group and Students in the First Control Group..... 25

5. Simple Frequency Distribution of Scores Achieved on the Final Exam by Students in the Second Experimental Group and Students in the Second Control Group..... 26

6. Reasons Given for Students Stating a Preference for the Quasi-Individualized Mastery Method of Instruction..... 27

7. Reasons Given for Students Stating a Preference for the Lecture-Discussion Method of Instruction..... 28

## THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The central issue of this research project was to determine if there was a difference in the performance on a mid-term and final exam between students taking a quasi-individualized mastery method of instruction and students taking a traditional lecture-discussion method of instruction in introductory sociology classes. A second issue was to determine if there was a difference between the proportion of students expressing a preference for one method of instruction over the other.

## THE HYPOTHESES

The first null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference between the mean scores achieved on an objective, multiple-choice mid-term and final exam by student groups taking a quasi-individualized mastery method of instruction, and student groups taking a traditional lecture-discussion method of instruction in introductory sociology.

The second null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference between the proportion of students who expressed a preference for the quasi-individualized mastery approach, as opposed to the number of students who expressed a preference for the traditional lecture-discussion method.

## BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Prior to the study, ways were being sought in the sociology department to make the first introductory course a better foundation for more advanced work. Students in upper level courses seemed to experience two basic difficulties: (1) they were unfamiliar with basic concepts in sociology, and (2) they seemed at times to have already delved deeply into certain specialized areas of social problems and social institutions.

This suggested that some teachers might have been omitting some of the fundamentals in an introductory course and spending too much time on their own "specialty" areas.[1]

Secondly, last year there was a reduction in the community college appropriations bill in the State of Illinois. The net effect of this action for Black Hawk College was a possible total deficit of $265,000.00.[2] This monetary crunch has resulted in a growing emphasis on increased productivity. Ways had to be found to increase teacher productivity without decreasing student performance.

According to the Carnegie Commission:

> ...more students can learn in independent modes that save faculty time for teaching additional courses or more students. Student-faculty ratios can therefore increase without inevitable loss of quality in instruction.[3]

The same report went on to say that independent modes of instruction or instructional technology may,

> provide the best means available to us for solving the difficult problem of continuing to educate growing numbers of students of all ages within a budget the American people can afford.[4]

These two problems--poor articulation of courses within the sociology department; and the current financial crisis of the college--demonstrated the need for engaging in this research project. This

---

[1]Memo from Kenneth Beausang, Black Hawk College, November 14, 1975. See Appendix, Document I.

[2]Ken Williams, "Muscle, Bone and Blood Cut from Budget," The Chieftan, February 11, 1976, p. 1, col. 4.

[3]The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Fourth Revolution. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 86.

[4]Ibid.

project served as a pilot program for future classes in introductory sociology. It demonstrated whether or not it was feasible to use a quasi-individualized mastery approach on a department wide basis.

Increased emphasis on productivity and accountability has created a need for more effective approaches in teaching. More and more college instructors have experimented with teaching methods based upon principles of contingency management.[5]

According to Goldwater and Acker:

> These programs have typically involved several characteristics: (a) course material is covered in relatively small units; (b) the student must attain a high level of performance ("mastery") in order to gain credit for a given unit and/or advance to further units; (c) the amount which the student covers, and often the rate at which he covers it, is individualized through self-pacing; (d) testing is carried out individually or in small groups through the use of student proctors, and (e) the student is provided with immediate feedback on his test performance. Reports on the application of these methods have claimed an encouraging degree of success (e.g., Alba and Pennypacker, 1972; Born, Gledhill, and Davis, 1972; Ferster, 1968; McMichael and Corey, 1969; Moore, Hauck and Cagne, 1973; Moore, Mahan and Ritts, 1969; Sheppard and Mac Dermott, 1970.[6]

These programs as outlined above are frequently referred to as the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI). According to Fernald, et. al, compared to traditional lecture approaches, this method of instruction, as well as producing significantly higher exam performance also results in more positive attitudes toward coursework.[7]

---

[5]F. S. Keller, "Goodbye teacher..." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, Volume 1, (1968), pp. 78-89.

[6]B. O. Goldwater and L. E. Acker, "Instructor-Paced, Mass-Testing for Mastery Performance in an Introductory Psychology Course," Teaching of Psychology, Volume 2, Number 4 (December 1975), p. 152.

[7]Peter S. Fernald, et. al., "Systematic Manipulation of Student Pacing, the Perfection Requirement, and Contact with a Teaching Assistant in an Introductory Psychology Course," Teaching of Psychology, Volume 2, Number 4 (December 1975), p. 147.

However, a study at Harford Community College of traditional group-oriented instruction and the self-instructional models indicated that the students studied were nearly equally divided in their preferences for the two teaching approaches. "The most prominent reason given for selecting the self-instructional model was the self-pacing characteristic, and that f the traditional model was the group emphasis."[8] A study at Moraine Valley Community College in Illinois indicated that while students favored an individualized course in sociology to traditional courses, they missed having a class identity and class discussion.[9]

The interest expressed in group activity in the Harford and Moraine Valley studies and the ideas of Amitai Etzioni influenced the development of the experimental design that was used in this project. Etzioni believes that the major emphasis of most textbooks and teachers in sociology has been on concepts, not the intellectual issues that lie at their root. For example, we need to examine the underlying causes of social problems. In Etzioni's words:

> Students introduced to sociological perspectives as they learn to deal with these and similar intellectural questions, rather than via conceptual categories, will be better able to perceive the deeper issues behind current events, as well as the issues behind events that will arise in the future, long after the college course is over.[10]

---

[8]Thomas D. Sepe and John J. Connolly, "An Analysis of Student Attitudes toward Divergent Modes of Instruction: Implications for Individualized Instruction," Research in Education, Volume 9, Number 1 (January 1974), p. 87.

[9]Joseph Jioia, "Individualized Instruction in Sociology: Myth and Fact," Research in Education, Volume 8, Number 2 (February 1973), p. 77.

[10]Amitai Etzioni, "The Importance of Humanistic Sociology," The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 19, 1976, p. 32, col. 3.

An additional influence in the design of this project was a sampling of courses using the personalized system of instruction taken in 1972 and 1974 by the PSI Newsletter. This survey indicated that individualized courses in sociology increased significantly from three courses in 1972 to sixteen courses in 1974. Although this sampling did not indicate the number of sociology classes being taught on an individualized basis today, it did seem to illustrate a growing trend in this direction.[11] This research project attempted to combine Etzioni's emphasis on a more humanistic sociology with the growing trend toward individualized instruction.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Lecture-Discussion method. For the purposes of this study the lecture-discussion method was operationally defined as a class meeting for three fifty minute sessions per week; two of these sessions were used for lectures and discussions related specifically to concepts covered in the text, and one of the sessions was used for specialized presentations (e.g. films, video tapes, guest speakers, and special lectures prepared by the instructor) that covered underlying causes of social problems and related issues.

Quasi-Individualized. This term was applied to the experimental condition in the research study. Students were allowed to take tests when they were ready, but they had to complete seven quizzes within an eight week time period.

---

[11] In Fred S. Keller, "Ten Years of Personalized Instruction," Teaching in Psychology, Volume 1, Number 1 (October 1974), p. 5.

Mastery. For this study mastery was defined as an 80 percent grasp of the material and three attempts for obtaining this score were allowed.

Experimental group. This group consisted of half of the class in two different sections of introductory sociology. They took the course under a format that combined an individualized mastery approach on two days a week with one day a week reserved for class discussion and special presentations as defined above.

Control group. This group consisted of half of the class in two different sections of introductory sociology that took the course under the lecture-discussion method as defined above.

Student proctor. For the purposes of this study, student proctors were two students selected from each class. They were stationed in an assigned testing area to score students' tests in the experimental group and provide them with immediate feedback. They recorded and kept track of the students' progress, and served as a liason between the students and the instructor.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One limitation of this study is that there was a smaller sample then would have been preferred. The instructor involved in this experiment taught only two sections of introductory sociology; this limited the sample to 47 students during the first half of the experiment and 42 students during the second half of the experiment. Also, since the sample was based on two intact classes, this limited the external validity of the study. Another limitation was that the

quiz and exam items were taken exclusively from a text book, "and text books may be so powerful as to override differences in instruction."[12]

Finally, the "Hawthorne Effect" may have contributed to the unreliability of this study. A cross-over design was used in order to draw comparisons; the students were aware that they were participating in an experiment and this may have influenced the outcome. Students may have performed better under the quasi-individualized design because of the demand characteristics of the experimental condition.

## BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions were made: (1) Since enrollments in all general introductory sociology sections are open to the student body, it was assumed that this sample population was reasonably representative of other classes in introductory sociology at Black Hawk College. (2) Since the same instructor was handling both classes involved in the experiment, it was assumed that any differences in outcome would be the result of the method used. (3) The mid-term and final exam were carefully designed from past tests in sociology, representative of both experimental and control group coverage, and were assumed to be adequate instruments for the measurement of student performance.[13] (4) Finally, the assumed homogeneity of the groups and the use of random sampling within the classes seemed to justify the use of parametric techniques.

---

[12] Hilgard, as cited by Dubin and Taveggin, The Teaching-Learning Paradox (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1968), p. 32.

[13] For sample items from the mid-term and final exam, see Appendix, Document III and Document IV.

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA

At the beginning of the spring semester, each of the two classes involved in the experiment were randomly divided in half by a drawing for position. Half of each class was in a control group and the other half was in an experimental group.

The control groups took the course under the traditional lecture-discussion format with occasional unit tests and a mid-term and/or final.

Unit tests were given approximately every two or three chapters. There were three unit tests for each control group prior to the mid-term and/or final. The highest two out of three scores were used in totaling the students' averages. No makeup tests were given. If students missed one of the unit tests they were only evaluated on the two that they took. However, if they missed a second unit test they were to be given a zero evaluation for that test, but this did not become necessary. Class participation and attendance were required on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.

The experimental groups took the course under a quasi-individualized mastery approach. They were required to join the control group every Wednesday for a lecture-discussion period. These Wednesday sessions consisted of general topics of interest related to text material, but not taken from the text. There were films, video tapes, and some guest speakers. On Mondays and Fridays, the experimental groups worked on chapter quizzes in the Independent Learning Center that were based on the mastery concept.

There were three forms for each chapter quiz. The chapter quizzes for the experimental group consisted of fifteen objective

items each. If students took one form of the quiz and were not satisfied with the score they went back to the chapter and workbook, reviewed the material, and retook a second form of the quiz. If they still weren't satisfied with the score, they reviewed and retook a third form of the quiz. However, it was recommended that a student obtained assistance from the instructor before taking the third form of the test. Students would not continue on to the next quiz until they had achieved 80 percent mastery of the material or attempted all three forms of the quiz.

Two student proctors selected from each class were in the Independent Learning Center to score these quizzes and give the students immediate feedback. The proctors were in the Independent Learning Center only on Mondays and Fridays during the scheduled class time. Although the monitors were in the Independent Learning Center every Monday and Friday, this did not mean that students in the experimental group had to be there every time. Students appeared at these sessions only when they were prepared to take a quiz. There were approximately twelve to fourteen sessions in which to complete seven tests.

Students who experienced difficulty with the testing were encouraged to contact the instructor; additional time for quizzes was arranged with a clerk in the Independent Learning Center. This did not mean that students who had put off all the quizzes until the end of the term were given extra time.

For the purposes of this experiment, a cross-over design was used. At mid-term, the control group and experimental group were switched around in each class. This gave all students in each section an opportunity to try out the new approach. Switching the groups also enabled comparisons to be drawn from the students as to which teaching

method seemed to be the most effective. Compared to designs where a student receives only one instructional method, the cross-over design seems to provide more sensitive measures of students' evaluations of an instructional method.[14]

The first experimental group was expected to have seven quizzes completed on or before March 1, prior to the mid-term exam. The second experimental group was expected to have seven quizzes completed on or before May 6, prior to the final exam. A comparison of the experimental and control groups was made on the basis of mid-term and final exam scores.

Finally, students were requested on the final day of the experiment to state their preference for one or the other instructional method. They were also asked to give the reason or reasons for their choice.[15]

PROCEDURES FOR TREATING DATA

Since a cross-over design was used in this study, the data collected generated two sets of mean scores--the mean scores achieved on a mid-term exam by the first experimental group and control group, and the mean scores achieved on a final exam by the second experimental group and control group. This allowed for a test-retest condition.

The null hypothesis was tested with a t-test. The level of significance was at .05, and the two-tailed critical value of t was utilized. If the calculated value of t exceeded the critical value

---

[14] G. Semb, "Research Strategies in Higher Education," Teaching of Psychology: Newsletter, December 1973, pp. 9-13.

[15] See Appendix, Document 11.

of t, then the null hypothesis was to be rejected. The alternative hypothesis, that there was a significant difference between mean scores achieved, would then be accepted.

A second set of data generated two proportions. These proportions were the number of students expressing a preference for the quasi-individualized mastery approach, as opposed to the number of students expressing a preference for the traditional lecture-discussion method.

The test that was employed was the z-test. The level of significance was at .05, and the two-tailed critical value of z was utilized. If the calculated value of z exceeded the critical value of z (1.96), then the null hypothesis would be rejected. The alternative hypothesis, that there was a significant difference between the proportion of students expressing a preference for one method of instruction over the other, would then be accepted.

In order to avoid the TYPE II ERROR of failing to recognize a significant difference which may be present, the .05 level of significance was used for analyzing all data in this study. Also, since the number of cases in each control and experimental group was small, the top and bottom scores in each distribution were dropped to avoid the influence of atypical scores on a small sample.

## RESULTS

Forty-seven students completed the first half of the experiment, and forty-two students completed the second half of the experiment.[16] As Table 1 shows, there was no significant difference between the mean scores achieved by the first experimental group and first control group on the mid-term exam. The 0.2 difference was not significant at the .05 level.

Table 1

A Comparion of Scores Achieved on the Mid-term Exam by Students in the First Experimental Group and First Control Group

| Group | n | df | t | Critical t .05 level | Mean | S. D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | 20 | 41 | 0.2[a] | 2.02 | 82.3 | 7.2 |
| Control | 23 | 41 | | | 82.8 | 7.4 |

[a]Difference not significant at the .05 level.

Table 2 shows that these results were repeated in the second half of the experiment. There was no significant difference between the mean scores achieved by the second experimental group and the second control group on the final exam. The 0.3 difference was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference between the mean scores achieved on an objective mid-term and final exam by student groups taking a

[16]The difference in these two numbers was the result of students dropping from the classes during the second half of the semester. For distribution of scores see Appendix, Tables 4 and 5.

quasi-individualized mastery method of instruction, and student groups taking a traditional lecture-discussion method of instruction was accepted.

Table 2

A Comparison of Scores Achieved on the Final Exam by Students in the Second Experimental Group and Second Control Group

| Group | N | df | t | Critical t .05 level | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | 19 | 36 | 0.3[a] | 2.03 | 78.3 | 7.2 |
| Control | 19 | 36 | | | 77.5 | 7.7 |

[a]Difference not significant at .05 level.

Table 3 shows that there was no significant difference between the proportion of students expressing a preference for the quasi-individualized method of instruction and the proportion expressing a preference for the traditional lecture-discussion approach. The calculated value of z (1.16) did not exceed the critical value of z (1.96); therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 3

A Comparison of the Percentage of Students Expressing a Preference for One Method of Instruction Over the Other

| Preference | N | % | z | Critical z .05 level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quasi-Individualized | 28 | 59.6 | 1.16[a] | 1.96 |
| Lecture-Discussion | 19 | 40.4 | | |
| N= | 47 | | | |

[a]Difference not significant at the .05 level.

Tables 6 and 7 in the Appendix give the reasons for students preferring one method of instruction over the other. The major reason students chose the quasi-individualized mastery method was the self-pacing;[17] the main reason students selected the traditional lecture-discussion method was the class interaction.[18]

---

[17] See Appendix, Table 6.

[18] See Appendix, Table 7.

## DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The limitations previously cited in this paper (i.e., smallness of sample, intact classes, heavy reliance on a textbook, and the use of one instructor) seriously reduce the external validity of this study. However, the data produced have implications for the sociology department of Black Hawk College.

Although there was no significant difference between the mean scores produced, and students seemed to be about equally divided on their preference for the two methods, this did not negate the effectiveness of the study. The thrust of this project was to investigate a way of increasing teacher productivity without decreasing student performance. Student performance was not decreased in this study.

The close division between students preferring the quasi-individualized mastery approach, and students preferring the traditional lecture-discussion method, indicates that the sociology department should investigate the possibility of offering both methods of delivery. This would allow students to choose whatever delivery system they felt would work best for them. This recommendation would increase the productivity of teachers in the department by increasing student-faculty ratios in some of the sections of introductory sociology. At the same time, students who did not function well under individualized instruction would be able to choose the traditional lecture-discussion method.

The major reasons students chose individualized instruction or lecture-discussion (self-pacing, and class interaction respectively) seem to be consistent with the recommendation to offer both delivery systems within the department. The previously cited findings of Sepe and

Connolly further strengthen this recommendation.[19]

Residual Finding

A large portion of students (47.3 percent) who chose the lecture-discussion method of instruction gave as one of their reasons increased contact with the instructor.[20] In addition, fifteen of the twenty-eight students who stated a preference for the quasi-individualized mastery approach (53.5 percent) expressed a desire for more contact with the instructor.[21] This indicated that a sizable portion of students might profit from a quasi-individualized mastery approach that had an instructor available at the testing sessions along with student proctors. This would free the instructor to handle any questions or difficulties the students might be having with the tests.

Further Studies

An additional study should be designed that would test the effectiveness of the quasi-individualized mastery method of instruction with the presence of an instructor in all testing sessions. A recommendation has been made to undertake this project in the 1976 summer session.

Secondly, the fact that there was no significant difference between the mean scores achieved in the experiment may have been the result of the quasi-individualized nature of the experimental approach. Perhaps there was not enough difference between the two methods used.

---

[19] Sepe and Connolly, op. cit.

[20] See Appendix, Table 7.

[21] See Appendix, Table 6.

An additional study that would compare the lecture-discussion method with a completely individualized approach would seem justified.

Currently, a member of the sociology department of Black Hawk College is developing a totally individualized television course in introductory sociology. The tapes are being designed to illustrate the underlying issues at the root of the basic concepts of sociology. The television course should meet Etzioni's demands for a more humanistic sociology, and also provide an excellent individualized delivery system to be compared with the traditional lecture-discussion method in a future study.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Black Hawk College. Memo from Kenneth Beausang to Marcella Rainey. November 14, 1975.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Fourth Revolution. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972, p. 86.

Dubin, R. and Taveggia, T. A. The Teaching-Learning Paradox. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1968.

Etzioni, Amitai. "The Importance of Humanistic Sociology," The Chronicle of Higher Education. January 19, 1976, p. 32.

Fernald, Peter S., et. al. "Systematic Manipulation of Student Pacing..." Teaching of Psychology, Volume 2, Number 4 (December 1975), p. 147.

Goldwater, B. C. and L. E. Acker. "Instructor-Paced, Mass-Testing for Mastery Performance in an Introductory Psychology Course," Teaching of Psychology, Volume 2, Number 4 (December 1975), p. 152.

Joia, Joseph. "Individualized Instruction in Sociology: Myth and Fact," Research in Education, Volume 8, Number 2 (February 1973), p. 77.

Keller, F. A. "Goodbye Teacher..." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, Volume 1, (1968), pp. 79-89.

Keller, F. S. "Ten Years of Personalized Instruction," Teaching of Psychology, Volume 1, Number 1 (October 1974), p. 5.

Semb, G. "Research Strategies in Higher Education," Teaching of Psychology: Newsletter, December 1973, pp. 9-13.

Sepe, Thomas D. and John J. Connolly. "An Analysis of Student Attitudes Toward Divergent Modes of Instruction: Implications for Individualized Instruction," Research in Education, Volume 9, Number 1 (January 1974), p. 87.

Williams, Ken. "Muscle, Bone and Blood Cut from Budget," The Chieftan, Volume XIV, Number 15 (February 11, 1976), p. 1.

# APPENDIX

DOCUMENT I

19

November 14, 1975

TO: Marcella Rainey, Associate Professor of Psychology and Sociology and Coordinator of Sociology Courses

FROM: Kenneth Beausang, Assistant Professor of Psychology and Sociology

RE: Improved articulation between introductory sociology and the more advanced 200 level sociology courses

This memo is in answer to your request that I look into the relationship between Soc. 100 and 200 level courses. I have observed a significant problem which I will clarify, and I am suggesting some possible solutions.

PROBLEM

It has become increasingly obvious over the past semester that we have to make some adjustments in our introductory sociology class in order to facilitate the smooth transfer of students into 200 level courses. Students in 200 level courses seem to experience two basic difficulties: 1) they are unfamiliar with basic concepts in sociology, and 2) they seem at times to have already delved deeply into certain specialized areas of social problems and social institutions.

This would suggest that some teachers may be omitting some of the fundamentals in an introductory course and spending too much time on their own "specialty" areas. I believe that departmental errors have caused this situation, and we cannot blame individual teachers.

First of all, last semester we had fourteen sections of Soc. 100 and nine of these were taught by three full-time teachers while the other five sections were taught by three part-time teachers. This spring semester we will be offering thirteen sections of Soc. 100 and seven of these will be taught by three full-time teachers while the remaining six will be handled by three, or possibly four, part-time teachers. I don't think we've made a strong enough effort to coordinate the efforts of full-time and part-time faculty members.

Secondly, it is nearly impossible to thoroughly cover all the material in most introductory sociology texts in one semester. As a result, individual teachers tend to select out some chapters and omit others at their own discretion.. The outcome is a pot-pourri of students that makes the teaching of some 200 level courses very difficult.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Since we are adopting Light & Keller as a new text next semester, I think now is a perfect time to sit down as a group to work out these difficulties. I think the following conditions would make this effort more beneficial:

1. Part-time teachers should be included in this group so they feel that they share a more active part in our department.
2. We should determine certain essential chapters that must be covered by all instructors.
3. We should determine which chapters should be omitted to avoid repetition in 200 level courses.

4. We should leave a significant number of chapters open for individual preference.
5. We should stress that we are not trying to limit academic freedom. How instructors handle the required units will be up to them, and we should encourage innovative techniques.
6. We should have follow up meetings in the spring to share common problems and see how we are doing in our efforts.

I would like to make one final suggestion that might be worth thinking about for the fall semester next year. Perhaps we could examine the possibility of offering all Soc. 100 courses on a lecture-independent lab. basis. For example, each instructor would be responsible for 1 or 2 topical lectures or discussions each week and then the rest of his time would be spent assisting students in working through individualized materials and tests in a laboratory setting. I know this would present several problems in logistics,but I think it might be worth the effort.

Student Preference Questionnaire

Please indicate which method of instruction you preferred for this course.

Control Group

Lecture-Discussion Format _____

Experimental Group

Quasi-Individualized
Mastery Approach _____

Please state the reason or reasons for the above choice.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

Sample Items from the Mid-term Exam

Which of the following best describes the sociological viewpoint.

a. Sociology sharply examines individual behavior.
b. Sociology is concerned exclusively with major social events.
c. Sociology explores patterns and regularities in human behavior.
d. Sociology deals with unique and irregular occurrences in human life.

A woman who is working full time at a demanding career and at the same time taking full responsibility for cleaning, cooking, and raising small children probably experiences:

a. normlessness.
b. role conflict.
c. discrimination.
d. structuralism.

The melting pot ideal involves:

a. the adoption of the language, customs, religion, and dress of the dominant culture by the immigrants.
b. the conformity by the immigrants to American ways, so that the immigrants' culture will be like that of the dominant culture.
c. the complete intermixing of the dominant culture with all of the different cultures of the immigrants, so that a hybrid culture emerges.
d. none of the above.

Sample Items from the Final Exam

"Work expands to fill the time available for its completion" is the essence of:

a. the Peter Principle
b. Parkinson's Law
c. the X Theory of human behavior
d. the Y Theory of human behavior

According to Yankelovich, which of the following statements about college youth of the 70s is/are true?

a. college youth place little emphasis on self-fulfillment in their work
b. youth stress any means, including violence, for the achievement of social objectives
c. there is lessening criticism of America as a sick society
d. none of the above are true

Today, a couple who stays married even though they are unhappy together and realize that the tensions between them are hurting their children might be considered:

a. ritualistic
b. innovative
c. rebellious
d. retreatist

Table 4

Simple Frequency Distribution of Scores Achieved on the Mid-term Exam by Students in the First Experimental Group and Students in the First Control Group

| Experimental | | Control | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Score | f | Score | f |
| 94 | 2 | 94 | 1 |
| 92 | 1 | 92 | 3 |
| 90 | 1 | 90 | 4 |
| 88 | 1 | 84 | 2 |
| 86 | 2 | 82 | 1 |
| 84 | 2 | 80 | 5 |
| 82 | 1 | 78 | 1 |
| 80 | 5 | 76 | 4 |
| 78 | 1 | 74 | 1 |
| 76 | 2 | 68 | 1 |
| 70 | 1 | N= | 23[a] |
| 66 | 1 | | |
| N= | 20[a] | | |

[a]As was mentioned in an earlier portion of this paper, the top and bottom scores have been dropped from each of these distributions to avoid the influence of atypical scores.

Table 5

Simple Frequency Distribution of Scores Achieved on the Final Exam by Students in the Second Experimental Group and Students in the Second Control Group

| Experimental | | Control | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Score | f | Score | f |
| 96 | 1 | 90 | 1 |
| 88 | 1 | 88 | 1 |
| 86 | 2 | 86 | 1 |
| 84 | 1 | 84 | 4 |
| 82 | 3 | 82 | 3 |
| 80 | 2 | 78 | 3 |
| 76 | 3 | 76 | 1 |
| 74 | 3 | 72 | 1 |
| 68 | 1 | 70 | 1 |
| 66 | 1 | 68 | 1 |
| 58 | 1 | 66 | 1 |
| N = | 19[a] | 62 | 1 |
| | | N = | 19[a] |

[a]Again, the top and bottom scores have been dropped from each of these distributions to avoid the influence of atypical scores.

Table 6

Reasons Given for Students Stating a Preference for the Quasi-Individualized Mastery Method of Instruction

N = 28[a]

| Reasons | N | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Self-pacing | 19 | 67.8 |
| 2. Reworking tests | 9 | 32.1 |
| 3. Better understanding | 10 | 35.7 |
| 4. Increased responsibility | 5 | 17.8 |
| 5. Less class attendance | 5 | 17.8 |
| 6. More frequent testing | 4 | 14.2 |
| 7. Better study habits | 3 | 10.7 |
| 8. More freedom | 5 | 17.8 |
| 9. Better preparation in final | 2 | 7.1 |
| 10. Immediate feedback | 2 | 7.1 |
| 11. Increased motivation | 3 | 10.7 |
| 12. Improvement of grade | 7 | 25.0 |
| 13. No fear of failure | 3 | 10.7 |

[a]Although 28 students expressed a preference for this method, 15 (53.5 percent) of them stated that they felt they would have profited from more contact with the instructor.

Table 7

Reasons Given for Students Stating a Preference for the Lecture-Discussion Method of Instruction

N = 19

| Reasons | N | Percentages |
|---|---|---|
| 1. More instructor contact | 9 | 47.3 |
| 2. Better understanding | 10 | 52.6 |
| 3. Class interaction | 14 | 73.6 |
| 4. Better motivation | 2 | 10.2 |
| 5. More structure | 6 | 31.5 |
| 6. Less work | 2 | 10.2 |
| 7. Better retention | 2 | 10.2 |

For Office Use Only

Practicum Director's Approval ___yes __no

Date Approval Was Mailed _____

For Office Use Only

Cluster _____

Multiple Practicum ___yes __no

Date Received _____

PRACTICUM PROPOSAL CHECK SHEET*

1. Name of participant(s): **Kenneth R. Beausang**

   Cluster: **Quad-Cities** Date: **April 26, 1976**

2. Job title: **Assistant Professor of Psychology-Sociology**

3. Area of specialization (circle one)

   a) Administration
   b) Behavioral Sciences
   c) Engineering Technology
   d) Curriculum and Instruction

4. Title of the practicum: **A Comparative Analysis of the Lecture-Discussion Method of Instruction And a Quasi-Individualized Mastery Approach in Introductory Sociology**

5. What change in your institution are you proposing? **A more beneficial means of offering introductory sociology in our department.**

6. Where will the practicum be carried out?

   Institution: **Black Hawk College**

   Department: **Psychology-Sociology**

7. Does the design contain criteria for measuring the results of the practicum? **Yes**

8. What are the required inputs?

   a) Estimated number of man-hours to do the practicum, and by whom?

   **250 hours -- K. R. Beausang**

   b) Are needed facilities and other means available?

   **Yes**

Note: If the performance of the practicum requires prior approval from a superior, has such approval been secured?

**Yes**

c) Time span -- when (date) will the practicum be started and when (date) is it expected to end?

April 10, 1976 to June 26, 1976

d) In case of a joint practicum, has the role of each practitioner been clearly and fully described?

9. Nova University target date for submitting proposal

April 26, 1976

10. Nova University target date for completed practicum

June 26, 1976

* As an aid to the participant in drawing up a practicum proposal (and for evaluation), this check sheet should be filled out and submitted with the proposal.